IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD

(Special Original Jurisdiction)

FRIDAY, THE FOURTH DAY OF MARCH
TWO THOUSAND AND FIVE

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE K.C. BHANU

WRIT PETITION NO : 4279 of 2005

Between:

M.A. Hakeem, Conductor, S/o.Azeez
Kothapally, Karimnagar District.

..... PETITIONER

AND

The Depot Manager A.P.S.R.T.C Karimnagar II Depot,
Karimnagar District.

.....RESPONDENT

Petition under Article 226 of the constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the Affidavit filed herein the High Court will be pleased to issue a writ, order or directions, more in the nature of writ of Mandamus, declaring the office order dt.16.9.1997 passed by the respondent herein as illegal and arbitrary and contrary to A.P.S.R.T.C., CC&A Regulations and set aside the same with all consequential benefits including arrears and pass such other order or orders.

Counsel for the Petitioner: MR.P.GOVINDA RAJULU

Counsel for the Respondent: SMT.P.RAJANI REDDY

The Court, at the admission stage, made the following :

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE K.C. BHANU

WRIT PETITION NO : 4279 of 2005

ORDER:

The petitioner is working as a conductor in the respondent-Corporation. He was issued a charge memo on 02-06-1997 and after receiving the explanation of the petitioner, the final orders were passed on 16-09-1997 imposing the penalty of withholding of one incremental stage for a period of one year with cumulative effect. The petitioner questioned the order on the ground that though there is reduction of annual increment for a period of one year with cumulative effect is a major penalty, the respondent passed the impugned order without conducting any enquiry as required under the rules. Therefore, the order is illegal and it is liable to be set aside.

2. The learned Counsel for the petitioner relied on a judgment of the Supreme Court in **Kulwant Singh Gill v. State of Punjab**[1] wherein the Supreme Court held that since the punishment imposed on the petitioner is a major punishment, the order cannot be sustained without an enquiry. The petitioner therefore seeks to declare that the order is illegal and it is liable to be set aside.

3. The petitioner after receiving the adverse orders slept over the matter for a period of 7 years. There are laches on his part in asserting his right regarding this issue. Though the impugned order is liable to be set aside, on account of long lapse of time in filing the writ petition and in view of the judgment of the Supreme Court in Kulwant Singh Gill (1 supra), I am of the view

that it would be appropriate if the punishment imposed on the petitioner is treated as reduction of one annual increment for one year without cumulative effect. The petitioner is not entitled for the difference of the amount, if any, by virtue of this order for the period from the date of the impugned order till the date of this order. But, he is entitled to get increments on notional calculation from the date of this order to which he is entitled, as he has been imposed penalty of reduction of one annual increment for one year without cumulative effect.

4. The Writ Petition is accordingly disposed of with the above observations.

_____

March 4, 2005

Kvr

To

1. The Depot Manager A.P.S.R.T.C Karimnagar II Depot,
   Karimnagar District.

2. 2 C.D copies.